7/17/2019 Anacostia Trash TMDL Development Meeting

Attendees:

EPA: Jillian Adair, Micka Peck, Greg Voigt

DOEE: Jonathan Champion, George Onyullo, Ed Dunne, Matt Robinson

MDE: Melissa Chatham, Anna Kasko, Greg Busch

Meeting Notes:

1) EPA's Status Report sent to the Courts on 6/28/2019
    a. The final status report was sent to the Courts and states that MDE, DOEE, and EPA have monthly conference calls and continue to analyze the available data. It also mentions MDE's and DOEE's intention to host a public process to propose an approach for the development of a TMDL endpoint to stakeholders and solicit feedback.
2) Draft document to share an approach for the development of a TMDL endpoint to stakeholders
    a. MDE and DOEE have reviewed the document and will plan to revise and add to it once the details of the TMDL endpoint and implementation are better agreed upon.
    b. DOEE suggests adding language in the TMDL endpoint paragraphs on how the proposed endpoint differs from the 2010 endpoint and how does it address the Court's order. In addition, we should add a definition for TMDL endpoint and move the background information to the end of the document.
    c. MDE suggests rephrasing the document to better communicate that its not necessarily a general public solicitation, but is directed towards known stakeholders. We want to maintain this as an informal process. Perhaps we could send the final document to stakeholders and give them six weeks to review and provide reactions. We could host a meeting around week three.
3) TMDL Endpoint Development Detail Table
    a. MDE suggests that we need to approach the table by considering both the numeric expression of the TMDL (quantitative) and the water quality goal (qualitative). How do these two factors interact? Perhaps like other TMDLs, we can incorporate certain exceedance frequencies or other statistical approaches to tie the quantitative goal to the qualitative and aesthetic water quality goal.
    b. DOEE: It is a good idea to provide descriptive definitions of the TMDL endpoint in the report. Recall that California TMDLs defined zero based on full capture systems designed to capture a density of rainfall. But full capture systems are not practical in the Anacostia due to heavy rainfall and available infrastructure.
    c. EPA: Perhaps we can provide a definition of the TMDL endpoint without requiring "full capture" technologies. It is possible to provide clarity on the endpoint considering measurements of trash removed in tandem with monitoring and visual assessments.
    d. MDE: We will want to preserve the current baseline load and maintain numeric expressions of the WLAs and LAs. Similar to other TMDLs, we can relate these trash loads to visual assessments, etc. to determine compliance.
    e. EPA: Like the 2010 TMDL, we can assume that 100% capture or removal of the baseline load would result in achievement of the water quality goal. In addition, we can consider measuring this achievement through trash assessments such as on-land visual assessments, rapid in-stream trash assessment methodologies, etc. This requires an

element of adaptive management and incorporates both trash assessments and trash removal metrics to determine compliance.

f. EPA: The nonpoint source columns in the table can be revised to reflect the measurements of the TMDL which counted all large items not capable of fitting through storm drains towards the nonpoint source baseline load.
g. A focus on illegal dumping and the enforcement of illegal dumping ordinances represents reasonable assurance that the nonpoint source loads will be reduced. In addition, apps and other resources for citizens to report illegal dumping hotspots are becoming available in the jurisdictions and will help to achieve the nonpoint source baseline load. As community clean-up events continue to collect large items, the nonpoint source load will be addressed.
h. In reasonable assurance or an implementation section, we can include a variety of potential BMPs to address trash along with descriptions and other relevant information to support their usage. Perhaps we can also include options for trash monitoring and assessment approaches as well as compliance information.

4) Next Steps
   a. Greg to share EPA's draft letter to DC Water
   b. Jillian to coordinate on scheduling an in-person half-day meeting to discuss the TMDL endpoint development details as a group
   c. Matt Robinson to share DOEE's trash implementation strategy
   d. Anna to share MDDNR's trash assessment protocol
   e. All to internally discuss and revise TMDL endpoint detail table in preparation for next meeting